

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2, 8, 13, 20, 23, 26, and 33-35 are amended. Claims 2-11 and 13-35 are pending and under consideration.

Rejection of Claims 33-35 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant amends claims 33-35 to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP Patent Application Publication 11-317065 to Kin. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kin does not disclose, teach or suggest at least, "wherein the air guide plate comprises an end portion having a wedge shape that is inclined in a direction in which the air flow above the disk proceeds to move the air flow above the disk up along the air guide plate," as recited in claim 8.

As noted on page 4 of the Office Action, "Kin fails to disclose a wedge-shaped end portion." Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 8 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 2-5, 13-17, 26-30, and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 2-5, 13-17, 26-30, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kin in view of U.S. Patent 6,147,834 issued to Srikrishna et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Srikrishna"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kin and Srikrishna, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the air guide plate is installed above and at least partially overtop of the disk," as recited in independent claims 2, 13, and 26. Instead, Srikrishna's fins 66 are located to the side of the disk as shown in Figures 1, 3, and 4 of Srikrishna. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2, 13, and 26 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 2 and include all of the features of claim 2. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 3-5 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 14-17 and 33 depend from claim 13 and include all of the features of claim 13. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 14-17 and 33 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and include all of the features of claim 26. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 27-30 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 6, 9-11, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 31, and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 6, 9-11, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 31, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kin in view of Srikrishna, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,948,176 issued to Cho et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Cho"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kin, Srikrishna, and Cho, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "wherein the air guide plate is installed above and at least partially overtop of the disk," as recited in claims 2, 13, 23, and 26. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2, 13, 23, and 26 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 6 and 9-11 depend from claim 2 and include all of the features of claim 2. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 6 and 9-11 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 13 and include all of the features of claim 13. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 18 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 24 and 35 depend from claim 23 and include all of the features of claim 23. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 24 and 35 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 31 depends from claim 26 and includes all of the features of claim 26. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 31 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 7, 22, 25, and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 7, 22, 25, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kin in view of Srikrishna and Cho, and further in view of “Low-Speed Wind Tunnel Testing” to Barlow et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Barlow”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kin, Srikrishna, Cho, and Barlow, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “wherein the air guide plate is installed above and at least partially overtop of the disk,” as recited in independent claims 2, 13, 23 and 26. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2, 13, 23, and 26 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 7 depends from claim 2 and includes all of the features of claim 2. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 7 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 22 depends from claim 13 and includes all of the features of claim 13. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 22 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 25 depends from claim 23 and includes all of the features of claim 23. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 25 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 32 depends from claim 26 and includes all of the features of claim 26. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 32 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 20 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 20 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kin in view of Cho. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kin does not disclose, teach or suggest at least, “wherein the air guide plate comprises an end portion having a wedge shape that is inclined in a direction in which the air flow above the disk proceeds to move the air flow above the disk up along the air guide plate, and wherein the air guide plate is installed above and at least partially overtop of the disk,” as recited in claim 20.

As noted on page 4 of the Office Action, “Kin fails to disclose a wedge-shaped end portion.” Cho also does not disclose this feature. In addition, Kin and Cho, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, “wherein the air guide plate is installed above and at least partially overtop of the disk,” as recited in claim 20. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 20 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claim 34 depends from claim 20 and includes all of the features of claim 20. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 34 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 2-11 and 13-35 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

December 20, 2006

By:

Paul F. Daebeler

Paul F. Daebeler

Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501